

REMARKS

With the cancellation of claim 4, claims 1-3 and 5-14 are pending. Claims 6-11 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation in the previously presented claim 4. The deletion of “containing a silicone content” and insertion of “wherein the solid content contains a silicone component” in Claim 1 is editorial and would not narrow the scope of the amended claim limitation. These amendments are supported at least by the original claims 1-2 and the specification in paragraph [0010]. Claim 5 has been amended to recite “wherein a portion of one surface of the film is adhered to a portion of the other surface of the film with an organic solvent.” The amendment is supported at least by the specification in paragraph [0049]. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced.

Paragraph [0049] of the specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. Descriptive support for the correction can be found at least in paragraphs [0009] and [0041], which disclose “0.002 to 0.5 g/m².” Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-5 and 12-14 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 4 has been canceled, rendering the rejection of claim 4 moot.

The Office Action indicates that in claims 1-2, the phrase “one and the same easily-slipping layer” is unclear and confusing. By the phrase “a friction coefficient between one and the same easily-slipping layer,” applicants refer to a friction coefficient between two portions of the surface of the same easily-slipping layer (e.g. when a film is folded and two portions of the surface of the same easily-slipping layer are rubbed against each other during friction measurements). Without conceding to the propriety of this rejection and in order to expedite prosecution, claims 1-2 have been amended to recite “(B) a friction coefficient between two portions of the surface of the same easily-slipping layer

satisfies a relationship of $\mu d \leq 0.27$.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2 (and all claims that depend therefrom) are in compliance with the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Office Action further states that the phrase in claim 5 “one surface and an other surface of the film ... mutually adhesive with an organic solvent” is unclear and confusing. Without conceding to the propriety of this rejection and in order to expedite prosecution, claim 5 has been amended to recite “wherein a portion of one surface of the film is adhered to a portion of the other surface of the film with an organic solvent.” Descriptive support for the amendments can be found at least in paragraph [0049]. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is in compliance with the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejections of claims 1-3 and 12 over Lee et al (US 6,818,312 or WO 02/072677) in view of Isaka et al (US 4,963,418).

Claim 1 as amended recites “wherein the easily-slipping layer includes a polyester resin component having a styrene moiety in a molecule thereof,” a phrase from the previously presented claim 4. The Examiner indicated that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have moved the relevant limitation from claim 4 to claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 1 (and claims 2, 3, 5, and 12-14 dependent therefrom), as currently amended, is allowable. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank Examiner Chen for indicating that claims 4 and 13-14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 as amended includes all the limitations of previously presented claim 4 and is in compliance with the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants submit that claim 1 (and claims 2, 3, 5, and 12-14 dependent therefrom), as currently amended, is allowable.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned regarding any questions concerning this amendment. In the event that the filing of this paper is deemed not timely, applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 11-0600 the petition fee and any other fees that may be required in relation to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: February 19, 2009

By: /King L. Wong/
King L. Wong
Reg. No. 37,500

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-1257
(202) 220-4200 (telephone)
(202) 220-4201 (facsimile)